

MR. JINNAH
(A Political Study)

Mr. JINNAH

(*A Political Study*)

Vol - II

by

V. N. NAIK, M. A.

Author of Indian Liberalism etc.,—

SADBHAKTI PUBLICATIONS

First Impression 1947

Printed & Published by Bhaskar Kashi
at Sadbhakti Prakash Printing Press,
12 Homji Street, Fort, Bombay, India.

MOHAMED ALI JINNAH

(A Political Study)

Mohamed Ali Jinnah, now the Governor-General of the Dominion of Pakistan, was born at Karachi of a rich Khoja family on Sunday, that was the Christmas day of the year 1876. On the 15th of August 1947, he completed seventy years and seven months and a half of his earthly pilgrimage. We wish him long life to see his dominion fashioned into shape, prosperous, powerful and well-knit; to be federated, in due time, with the Union of India for the defence of the vast subcontinent that we have known as one country as the result of the British dominion of India from 1757 to 1947. The Battle of Plassey saw the British footstool planted in Calcutta. Madras and Bombay had already come under its sway. Sitting on the tripod the muse of history was pointing to the new map of India unrolled before her prophetic gaze. By 1818 and 1857, the vision had materialised, with the independent Indian States turned into protected princes of India under the sovereign rule at the Centre. From that time onwards one government, one system of administration, and a uniform system of Western Education, had led to consolidation and reconstruction that we knew as British India. And in that part of India at Karachi was born Mr. Jinnah at the end of 1876, and on the eve of the Durbar at Delhi in the regime of Lord Lytton, held to proclaim Queen Victoria, at the instance of the Jew Prime Minister of England, as the Empress of India. Now that title is

gone, and we have King George of England changed into the King, and not the King-Emperor, of Pakistan and of the Union of India severally, as units, for the time being, of the British Commonwealth of Nations, associated with that Commonwealth till July 1948 by common allegiance to the crown, and free to go out or remain within according to their own choice thereafter.

This partition of India is the handiwork of Mr. Jinnah and it has brought within his domain, a portion of Ranjit Singhji's Punjab, and of the Hindu-Muslim reunited Bengal of 1911. We do not know what the verdict of history on this achievement will be. But today Muslims are in high glee. There is no room here for anger and recrimination. There is ample room for the searching of the heart within, and for retracing steps if there can be any retracing at all, from past mistakes, and for guarding against future blindness and blunders. History, said Carlyle, is the biography of individuals writ large. Minus hero-worship, we shall endeavour to write this sketch and appreciation of Mr. Jinnah in the light of that dictum, and present it to our readers as a study in political biography written, as far as possible, in the dry light of intellect.

II.

Mr. Jinnah's life-story is soon told. After finishing his early education at Karachi he was sent to England, at the age of sixteen, to read for the bar.

There he came into contact with Dadabhai Naoroji and worked as his private secretary while he was pursuing his legal studies. Dadabhai discovered in him a young man worthy of such training. From him Mr. Jinnah imbibed the nationalism which marked his political outlook and work till the end of 1929. He rose in his profession within three years of his being called to the bar in 1896 and settling in Bombay in 1897 to make his career in that profession. He is reported to have "devilled" for a few years in the chamber of Mr. Macpherson, the then Advocate-General of Bombay. The Caucus-case, in connection with the election of Sir Pherozshah Mehta from the Justices of the Peace to the Municipal Corporation, gave Mr. Jinnah wide publicity as a lawyer and publicist. He became a member of the Bombay Presidency Association, and signed its memorandum to Lord Minto against separate communal electorates for Muslims proposed for inclusion in the Minto-Morley reforms. As his biographer tells us, he attended the Calcutta Congress in 1906 presided over by Dadabhai Naoroji; and the Karachi Congress in 1911 in which Sir William Wedderburn sought to bring about Hindu-Muslim Unity. In that Congress, and when the particular entente was under discussion, he sat as a cross-bencher and not along with the Mohamedans. He went on Congress deputation to England in connection with the reform of the India Council. He was chosen for that mission from Bombay by Sir Pherozshah Mehta. Gokhale discovered in him at that time a man "with the true

stuff in him and that freedom from all sectarian prejudice which will make him the best ambassador of Hindu-Moslem Unity." And Mr. Jinnah then aspired to be Muslim Gokhale. In addition to Gokhale and Dadabhai, his models at the time were Buddrudin Tyabji and Pherozshah Mehta.

With a growing practice at the bar he won a growing influence over his compatriots as a nationalist and patriot. He did not enrol himself as a member of the Muslim League founded in 1906 till the end of 1913, persuaded to do so by Moulana Mohamed Ali, then editor of the *Comrade* and, later on, the leader of the Khilafat movement in India, and, therefore, an ally of Mr. Gandhi in his non-co-operation programme of 1921 and 1922. When he joined the Muslim League, he made it clear to the two friends, who had persuaded him to enrol himself as a member of that political body, that "loyalty to the Moslem League and the Moslem interest would in no way and at no time imply even the shadow of disloyalty to the larger national cause to which his life was dedicated." That was in 1913, and in the years that followed Mr. Jinnah worked ceaselessly and sincerely "in the cause of complete friendship and understanding between the Hindu and Moslem communities", with the result that in 1915, after the death of Gokhale and Mehta, he succeeded in bringing about an entente cordiale between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, and made them both the sponsors of the same goal for India.

Pledged to the welfare of India as a whole, Mr. Jinnah, at that time, made the Muslim League adopt the same political goal as the Indian National Congress. The new constitution adopted by the Moslem League materially embodied the then Congress ideal. In its clause D, according to the biographer of Mr. Jinnah, occur the following words: "Attainment, under the aegis of the British Crown, of a system of self-Government suitable to India, through constitutional means, by bringing about amongst others, a steady reform of the existing system of administration by promoting national unity, by fostering public spirit among the people of India, and by co-operating with other communities for the same purpose." This was about 1912, when the sectarian character of the League founded in 1906 was improved out of existence, and when Mr. Jinnah attended its special Conference at Calcutta at the invitation of its official secretaries, and when he gave his informal and invaluable support to the Clause D mentioned above. He became its member, as has been pointed out, in 1913 and soon after, its president, veering the League activities round to fit them in with the national outlook of the Congress itself.

Mr. Jinnah was specially nominated by the Viceroy Lord Hardinge as Member to the Imperial Legislative at Delhi in 1913 in connection with the Waqf Validating Bill. He showed great tact and skill in piloting the measure through, and won the encomium of his colleagues in the Legislature and of his co-religionist all over India. His legal acumen, his

mastery over the intricacies of the bill, his firm, though wise, handling of matters of controversy in it, revealed him as a leader eminently fitted for work in the Legislature more than for work outside. From 1916 onwards he has been doing that work not only to the satisfaction of his separate communal constituency but, with certain outstanding exceptions, to the satisfaction of the people as a whole. His absence from the Central Legislature is ever missed, whatever the side he may take in a particular debate and on a particular question. And he is never known to be a government man but is always known to be a man in opposition, and to be reckoned with as such. Apart from his change of attitude from 1937 onwards, he has been an invaluable asset to the Council deliberations, and his weight counts on whichever side he chooses to throw it. He is more suited, by temperament and knowledge, for debate in a Committee and across the table, than for public platform, communal or otherwise. His talents are pre-eminently forensic to which politics has added a lustre and a publicity all its own. His last phase of self-assertion is but an extension of his pleading at the bar and his practice in the Council Hall, the note of which has always been "Audace, audace, toujours audace".

From 1917 his nationalism had made him, after the internment of Mrs. Annie Besant, a champion of the Home Rule movement in India. As president of the Bombay Branch of the Home Rule League, he

became the idol of the people, if not the idol of the crowd and the market-place. For in temperament he is an aristocrat, and knows to keep the crowd at arm's length and to hold his own against it. During 1920 and 1929 Mr. Jinnah seemed to have held aloof from all public activity. The Khilafat agitation and the non-co-operation movement were not to his taste. He withdrew from the Congress, and his Muslim League had fallen upon bad times. A rival league was started in the Punjab to checkmate him, and the division had impaired the activities of both. But he had the art of masterly silence, and knew how to bide his time. The advent of Lord Irwin in India changed the scene for him. The discussions over the proposed R. T. C. in London found him again in the mid-stream of politics as an individual citizen and politician, and much less as a Muslim Leaguer or as the partizan of the Congress, which body he had given up to attend from 1922 onwards. The last that he spoke in its session was in 1921 and to warn the delegates, in bold and uncompromising language, against the consequences of non-co-operation. He wholeheartedly approved Lord Irwin's terms for the R. T. C. in London, though he confined his support of them as applying purely to British India. In his politics, up-to-date, he has left the consideration of the Native States severely alone. Perhaps he believed then, and he believes even today, that once British India sets its own house in order and establishes its firm foot-hold as a self-governing entity, the question of the Native States was bound to

solve itself. Does not his latest declaration about them lend countenance to this view, though the context now is so different from what it was in the beginning of 1928 and 1929? The Simon Commission found him allied completely with other parties and leaders in the country who had upheld its complete boycott by the people. The purely white commission had found no countenance from any leader in the country worth that name. His pro-Muslim bias had not reached the aberration then to support the Commission for the sake of exclusively Moslem interests.

The first and the second R. T. C. found him in England, but a different man from what he was till the end of 1928. And then came his fourteen points to the front, his disowning of the Federal government at the Centre, his enunciation of separate Muslim interests, used by the Secretary of State for India for his own plan of "divide and Rule" in India. He was not present, for he was not chosen, at the third R. T. C. which practically sealed the fate of full responsible self-government for India in 1935, and plunged it for twelve years in bitter controversy and upheaval, leading to division and disunity in India. Mr. Jinnah's fourteen points were won, but they put off the day of India's liberation, and brought into the bargain, enmity between Hindus and Muslims, the like of which was never witnessed before in India.

That brings us to the year 1937 in the life-story of Mr. Jinnah. The elections had been won all over

the country principally by the Congress and the Muslim League and the Congress refused to form coalition ministries in the provinces including in its Cabinets Muslims chosen by the Muslim League. That was the first and the just grievance of the Muslim League and its president Mr. Jinnah against the Congress, its high command, its parliamentary committee, and its zonal dictatorship. Sure of their majority in the provincial assemblies, they did not care what Muslim they included in the provincial cabinets, and simply flouted the Opposition as unworthy of their consideration. The electorates of the Councils were simply ignored, and the Ministries did what the High Command bid them do. This was the beginning of the quarrel between the Muslim League and the Congress which enabled Mr. Jinnah to organize the League as a force in the country and to rally the Muslims round its standard.

Mr. Jinnah's toughness, his single-pointed endeavour, his clear conception of what he wanted to achieve, and his power to communicate precisely to the Muslim people what he was out to win for them at any cost, were more than a match for the Congress campaign of mass contact, for its asseveration, in season and out of season, that it alone represented the whole of India, and that it would simply ignore the Muslim League as representing the Musulmans. The louder it shouted and the more insistently it made that exclusive claim, the easier it became for Mr. Jinnah to show up that august body as speaking

only for the Hindus in India, and as out to trample every other interest under its foot. And the Congress gave Mr. Jinnah numerous uncalled for occasions to dot the i's and cross the t's of that charge. Thus the singing of Bande Mataram in the Assembly, the hoisting of the Congress flag on the houses of Legislature, the naming of educational Institutions by distinctly Hindu names, the fetish of Hindustani, the cult of the charka in the scheme of basic education—all these served that purpose. Through them Mr. Jinnah could sophisticate and shout to the whole world that the Congress was a caste-Hindu organisation and was out to impose Hindu culture on the rest of India, that it was a menace to Islam and all that it meant for the Mussulman inhabitants of India. It was enough fat in the fire of fanaticism. The cry of religion in danger is ever a good rallying cry to win the doubters to your side. Astute as Mr. Jinnah is, he made a full use of the crotchets of the Congress, vain and superfluous as they were in themselves, to strengthen the hold of the Muslim League on the Muslim mass mind to swell the number of its adherents.

This was the work that he did from 1937 to 1939, and when the Congress Ministries resigned with the opening of the second world war, he declared the occasion as the day of deliverance for the whole of India. Mr. Jinnah now proved to be an able general and he created a Muslim United Front to effectively resist any demand by the Congress for its co-operation with the war-effort of the government in power.

That is the story of his public life from the beginning of 1940 to the end of the war in 1945. And in that he made full use of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery being in power in England, as they used him to checkmate the Congress. Any step in advance was made to depend on the consent of the Muslim minority to it. And the issue was fought later on, as not between the Muslim League and the Congress, but as between the caste-Hindus and the Muslims. To that pass the situation had been brought in 1942, and the Cripps proposals, being rejected by all, each for its own different reasons, still worsened matters for the Congress and for the Hindus along with it. The war was fought and the war was won by Great Britain and her Allies. Germany was beaten and Japan was smashed. The latter's invasion of India proved, after all, no better than a bubble and the Congress slogan of "Quit India" had proved in the end a damp squib. With 1945 the Congress seemed to have learnt the lesson that it had not learnt at the end of 1939. But the interregnum had benefitted Mr. Jinnah and his Muslim League beyond measure, and he did not fail to do his utmost to dictate to the Congress at every step it took to conciliate him. The advent of Lord Wavell as the Viceroy of India, the exit of Mr. Churchill from the government of England, the Labour Government in England, and the Cabinet Mission in India, the wooings of Mr. Gandhi, the frowns of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and the threats of Vallabhbhai Patel, were all the same to him. He stuck to his guns and has at last won Pakistan for

the Muslims and vindicated his two-nation theory for India. June 3 had undone all previous dates, and July 13 had set a coping stone on it. And August 15 sounded the joybells in Pakistan. Here ends the story of Mr. Jinnah's life, and it may well be *Nunc Dimitis* for him.

III.

Today Mr. Jinnah is the idol of the Muslims in India. Once he was the idol of the Indians. When he rose to be an eminent lawyer in the city of Bombay forty years ago; when one saw a tall, thin, finely groomed, meticulously dressed young man, with sharp, round eyes, long face, thin lips, a mouth closed, with language measured and precise; with firm tone, with unshaken determination in pursuing an argument, and making a point without persiflage or beating about the bush; with non-challant air of facing the counsel on the opposite side with equal hauteur, as in defence of Mr. Horniman and Tilak; or with self-confidence, pleading boldly before a judge, and in the famous Caucus case, one discerned in him the making of a leader at the Bar and a leader in the country. To use his own words, he had courage, he had concentration, he had character, and he had perseverance, and, notwithstanding a few years of early struggle, failure for him was out of question. Whatever Mr. Jinnah may be, he is no wobbler, and he means what he says and means all that he says. He is no trickster but goes straight to the point. And

he is keen in detecting duplicity in others and catching them on the hip. Hence, he can easily floor them and throw them overboard. Rapier like he pierces an opponent's argument and hits the nail on the head.

Sturdy independence, a nature incorruptible, a personality that never knew fumbling and finessing, were the characteristics of the rising young man as they are, apart from his opinions and the side he has taken in politics and the role that he has played during the last eight years as the president of the Muslim League, the characteristics of the old man of seventy today. Forty years after 1906, when in the Congress at Calcutta he served Dadabhai Naoroji as his private secretary, we find Mr. Jinnah today hating the Congress, and describing the Congress President as the show-boy, denouncing it as a caste-Hindu organisation, and speaking for his community alone irrespective of the interests of the country as a whole. No more is he the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity, except on his own terms and dictating them, as it were, at the point of the bayonet. He hates the Congress and its present leaders, he has failed to brush aside sectarianism, and he makes a fetish of culture and religion in the interest of communalism and communal politics. Forty years ago he started his political career as a nationalist and a radical, a patriot and lieutenant of Gokhale with Sir Pherozshah Mehta as his mentor. Today we know not what he thinks of them. One of them was a Hindu and

the other a Parsi. One belonged to the majority community, the other to a community that has never claimed special rights as a minority and is proud to own itself as belonging to India. Gokhale was the champion of Hindu-Muslim Unity. He had conceded communal electorates to Muslims in 1909, and in a famous speech at Poona, suggested how, in course of time, communal electorates could be wiped out from the constitution by wise and far-seeing policy of the leaders concerned. Sir Pherozshah Mehta condemned the change outright as a great blunder, and as the thin end of the wedge that was meant to split India in the interests of the ruling power. Mr. Jinnah, at the time, subscribed wholehearted to that view, but today, from the radical and the nationalist that he was, he has become an out-and-out communalist. Verily did Burke say that those who begin as extreme whigs, not unoften, end as extreme Tories. A writer on "Mr. Jinnah—my Leader," remarks that in India an Akbar is ever followed by an Aurangzab, that is, a radical reformer by a narrow-minded, bigoted fanatic who undermines the work of the reformer, and paves the way for the utter ruination of a noble cause. We are proud to own Mr. Jinnah as an Akbar, "the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim Unity." We shall be sorry if his admirers of today hail him as an Aurangzeb with the fatality that dogged the footsteps of that emperor.

It was Sir Pherozshah who was the first to notice the traits in him as a young rising lawyer

of the people of India, and that leaders of both sides will periodically meet together to find a *modus operandi* for joint and concerted action in questions of public good." That was in 1913, and the invitation of Muslim League to hold its session in Bombay at the end of 1915 was a step to put that resolution into effect. For the Congress was invited that year to meet in Bombay by Gokhale and Mehta under the presidentship of Lord Sinha (then Sir S. P. Sinha) to heal up the breach in its own ranks. Gokhale died in February 1915 and Mehta followed him in November. Yet the Muslim League and the Congress met in the same city and laid the foundation of the *entente cordiale* which was to fructify in the Lucknow pact sponsored by Tilak, and in the Congress-League scheme to follow it.

It was Mr. Jinnah with Mr. Muzrul Hagué, as the president of the Session in Bombay, who brought about the *entente*. This move was sought to be checkmated by rowdy and reactionary elements in the Muslim camp. These, used for that purpose by wire-pullers behind, stormed the Session of the League on its opening day, with the result that it had to be adjourned for the time being. Goondas were rushed into the pandal, who asked Messrs. Hagué and Jinnah to prove that they were pucca Moslems, as they wore no beard and had no fez on their heads. Mr. Jinnah stood up bravely to the storm, and, in the end, defeated the machinations of those who wanted the session to be abortive. The

writer clearly remembers the scene on Marine Lines in December, 1915, and, following the success of the League, the scene in the Congress pandal near the Churchgate Station where the Congress was at home to the delegates of the Muslim League. Cordiality, hearty greeting, and a perfect picture of Hindu-Muslim Unity for a common National Cause,—that was the note of the rejoicing—a scene which would have gladdened the heart of the two great leaders of India who had departed from their field, when the two bodies had assembled in Bombay. Mr. Jinnah's was the complete triumph on one side. The Congress welcomed the move on its own side and wholeheartedly supported Mr. Jinnah. From 1915 to 1920, the Congress and the League were on the best of terms with each other. And Mr. Jinnah was the common bond of "harmonious work and co-operation" between the two great national institutions, and between the two great communities of India.

It was the Khilafat agitation that gave the older League its first blow and led, later on, to the foundation of a rival league in the Punjab under the leadership of Sir Mohamed Shafi. The Ali Brothers, for the time being, came over to the Congress and Mr. Jinnah left it for good. He went into political retirement for many years after. He had to sit in the Imperial Legislative Assembly as representative of the Muslims, seeking election through separate communal electorates—the joint-gift of Aga Khan and Lord Minto to India out of which have risen evils

too numerous to mention here, and the worst of which has been the conversion of the nationalist Mr. Jinnah into the anti-nationalist champion of Pakistan. He who had stoutly opposed separate communal electorates as detrimental to the progress of his own community in 1908, has been found at the end of 1945 not only their stout supporter but a champion of a separate Muslim state in India—sovereign, independent, Pakistan—that shall have nothing to do with Hindustan as he calls it, by any link or tie, whatever, of Federation, Confederation, or any other form of commonwealth relationship with the Hindus of India. That is the *reductio ad absurdum* of communal electorates and of communalism in politics, the like of which has not been witnessed in any other country of the world. The political importance of the Muslim minority conceded in 1909 by the successor of the Mogul rule in India grew into the claim of a separate sovereign state and homeland for the Muslims of India. Accept communal electorates, fundamentally vicious and fundamentally wrong, as is made so patent and clear in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report of 1918, and there can be no other sequel to it than what we witness in our midst today and all around us. But the tragedy of it and the pity of it too, is, that fates should have chosen Mr. Jinnah to be its fiercest exponent and protagonist. We realize today how terrible has been the price and what heavy price India has to pay for it.

V.

Mr. Jinnah as a bitter communalist is the creation of the Indian National Congress and its dictatorship, through the High Command, over the provinces that it ruled from 1937 to the end of 1939. The Congress Parliamentary Committee and the Zone dictatorships that it established in the provinces under its control, practically destroyed the parliamentary method of government and the responsibility of the Ministry to the electorates that had sent it to power. The Legislatures became mere registering bodies of the fiat of the zone dictators and the High Command and of the power behind the throne. As such the Opposition in the provincial assemblies was reduced to a farce, and the minorities concerned felt keenly that they were being ridden rough-shod by the mere brute majority in the legislatures, which were slavish instruments in the hands of the zone dictators. If only the Congress had been wise and far-seeing in the wielding of the power that the elections had placed in its hands, the Muslims minorities in Congress Provinces would not have gone into the hands of Mr. Jinnah, and helped him to swell the cry that Islam was in danger and Hindu Raj had come to stay in India. It is events that make the fortune of slogans and not slogans that make the fortune of events. If the Cabinets in Congress provinces had included a due proportion of Muslims chosen by the Muslim League, and a depressed class minister of the choice of the proper leader of the

scheduled classes, all the tension that followed, all the bitter feeling that was created, all cries of the tyranny of the majority, could have been avoided. But the Congress chose to grasp all, and had ultimately helped to destroy the unity of India. It was not actual mal-administration but high-handed administration that roused the ire of Mr. Jinnah against the Congress and, unjustly, against the Hindus as the majority community of India. For what the Congress had really done was to establish in the provinces under its sway the Congress Raj and, by no means, the Hindu Raj. We do not desire to rake up the dead past except to explain Mr. Jinnah and seek to understand how a nationalist like him could suddenly become a communalist of the deepest dye and, what is worse still, an enemy of the Hindus and a propagandist for the division of India in the days after the partition of Bengal. He was no communalist after the Minto-Morley Reforms. He did not swear by the Muslim League till 1913. And he repudiated its secretarism and had weeded it out by 1915. He did not abandon the Congress till 1921. He attended the All-Parties' Conference in 1923. He was in favour of Joint Electorates with reservation of seats and weightage for the Muslim Minority till 1929. It was from that date onwards that he had gone astray, and the Act of 1935 had found him on the borderline. 1937 saw him a changed man altogether, and in 1939 he emerged as the out-and-out opponent of the Congress which he now then he dubbed as a purely

Hindu organisation. The resignation of the Congress Ministries in 1939, he declared as the day of deliverance, and since that time onward he would have nothing short of Pakistan to solve the political deadlock in the country. That is the long and short of his political sublimation or political apostasy, whatever one side or the other may choose to call it. Today he seems to have won, all along the line. India is surely weakened by partition, and the Pakistan, which even the Cabinet Mission had disapproved, has been surrendered to him by the Congress High Command. May 16, December 6, 1946 and June 3, 1947: mark these dates and the corresponding years, and nothing more need be said about it.

As a Nationalist and radical, after the death of Gokhale and Mehta, his highest achievement was the presidentship of the Home Rule League in Bombay after the internment of Mrs. Annie Besant, and his protest against the Willingdon Memorial Meeting in the Town Hall of Bombay. Those who watched the scene on that memorable day will not forget how he was lionised by the crowd in front of the Bombay Town-Hall. He was a fierce Home-Rule Leaguer before then, and that day brought him the fame which resulted in a monument to his public service and to his great patriotic fervour in the shape of the Jinnah Memorial Hall in Girgaum. Think of that Hall, of the Congress House, and think of Mr. Jinnah as he figures today, and you cannot help noting in

it a cruel irony of fate—the juxtaposition of the People's Jinnah Memorial Hall to the Bombay Congress House, when today Mr. Jinnah is so bitterly opposed to the Congress itself. He would not like to be called today a people's man, he would hate it, for the people to him in India are now no other than the Moslems and his home is nowhere today but in Pakistan. The idea makes one think furiously of the bubble-reputation that man so greedily runs after, and considers it as the priceless reward of public work. "Roses, roses, all the way." He has, we like to think of him still, stern and abiding characteristics of true leadership in him, and he will not say anything just to please and flatter. In his championship of the Muslim cause he is not the creation of the populace any more than he is the creation of the government. On the other hand, it was he who, since 1937, had made the Muslim League the powerful organisation that it is today, while all other parties had gone down before the Congress like nine pins. The mass contact of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru he swept by the board. The nationalist Muslims he had beaten hollow. But he has forgotten one thing, the supremest factor in sound politics, that the country is greater than the Muslim League as it is greater than the Congress, and India is older and greater than Pakistan or Hindustan, as he chooses to style the two divisions and "the train shall meet."

VI.

Mr. Jinnah is a lawyer pure and simple, with politics as the second string to his fiddle. Today the politician and partizan have submerged the lawyer, and he looms large as an autocrat and dictator of the Muslim League. With the monocle that he wears he reminds us of Joseph Chamberlain who began his career as a businessman and radical politician of Burmingham and ended it as a Unionist and Imperialist of the deepest dye—an extreme whig turned into an extreme Tory at the end of the chapter. The simile, it has to be remembered, does not go on all fours. One of his latest admirers and henchmen has written of him, "Honesty without humbug, and honesty which even his severest critics have never called in question, and honesty which seeks no shelter in sanctimonious spiritual impediments, which abjures alike the halo and the high place, the beard and the bargain, the mystic voice and the money-value—an unemotional shrewdness which strips facts down to the floor till the early hours of the morning, examining and re-examining, weighing and valuing each detail of the decision upon which the very life and death of his people depend—perseverance which recognises no obstacle as insurmountable; intellectual acumen which can see the whole in detail as part of the whole—such is the man and the statesman, the Qaid-i-Azam of ninety million Muslims, the Disraeli of Indian politics—Mohamed Ali Jinnah."

It is, indeed, unfortunate that Mr. Jinnah should be likened to Disraeli, the Prime Minister of England in the days of Queen Victoria. We are not quoting here what Morley or Froude have said of him. We quote here what a Frenchman and a man of letters says of him. Andre' Maurois says of Lord Beaconsfield, and of his success and failure as the leader of the Conservative party: "Dizzy had thought that a great man, supported by the church and the young nobility, could refashion England. In old age Beaconsfield saw in the church first and foremost a body of jealous dignitaries, of seekers after bishoprics, of rival sects, and, if he had found among the young nobility friends, he had never found there that great school of the natural leaders of the race, as he had so loomingly depicted them. His desire had been to give to a whole nation an intellectual and romantic ideal; he had failed. And he had failed precisely because he was an aristocrat of the spirit." We hope and pray that Mr. Jinnah fails not as the Benjamin Disraeli of the future politics of Pakistan. Disraeli began as a radical and ended as a Conservative; Jinnah began as a radical and nationalist and has ended as communalist. Jinnah, born a plebian, is an aristocrat in spirit. At the age of seventy-seven Disraeli had to confess that the pursuit of power had lost its attractions for him, and he had no further thought of it. He added, in a chastened and a humble mood, "I have known something of action in my life—it is a life of baffled hopes and wasted energies." And his biographer adds, as a commentary on this

confession, "If he let his spirit glean the field of memory, he could gather a rich harvest of lessons in modesty. He had seen the Whigs in a frenzy to pass the Reform Bill, the first effect of which had been to keep them out of power; he had seen the Tories hailing as a triumph the extension of this detested Reform. He had seen Peel emancipate the Catholics after bringing Canning to ruin; he had seen Disraeli drop protection after overturning Peel; and now he beheld Gladstone in the act of threatening Russia, after heaping maledictions upon Beaconsfield. He had seen the mob acclaim Wellington, and then boo him; acclaiming and booing, and then adoring Mr. Gladstone. He had seen the most pacific of Ministers adopt the most bellicose of politics, and the most germanophile of Queens take delight in thwarting Bismark. And what, in fifty years, would be the consequence of his own Berlin policy?" And yet Disraeli had remained astonishingly faithful to his ideas of youth, and his programme of 1880 might well have been signed by Coningsby. Can one say as much of Mr. Jinnah, "the Disraeli of Indian politics"? Yes, only in one respect the comparison does not fail. Perhaps Jinnah's Pakistan may grow into Pan-Islam, as Disraeli's great Tory democratic England had at last developed into the Imperialism of the Primrose League. Comparisons are dangerous and one had better not be tempted into them. We pity the henchman who compared Mr. Jinnah to Mr. Benjamin Disraeli.

Mr. Jinnah is a lawyer with a flair for fine and forceful advocacy and has, in consequence, proved a better politician than an ordinary layman. In legislative assemblies lawyers have been generally known to do better than laymen. If you are not a lawyer by profession, you must, atleast, have the training of a lawyer for that purpose. The late Mr. Tilak advised every aspirant to journalism and politics, before he entertained his services, to go and study law. We know on good authority how Mehta not only advised but made Gokhale go through a course of study in law soon after the latter had entered the Imperial Legislative Council in 1903. The forensic talent is an invaluable equipment for a sound politician and for a member of the legislature to scent the mischief at a distance, and be a jealous guardian of a people's rights. Even today, when Mr. Jinnah has gone over exclusively to his co-religionists and given up law as a profession, he is being greeted by his party as Quaid-i-Azam. Mr. Jinnah is a lawyer and, therefore, he is a keen politician. But in his last phase it is precisely on that account that he excels more as a disputant than as a statesman. Even in the interests of the cause he so loudly and reiteratingly champions, he does not seem to realise that the splitting up of India is the weakening of India and the weakening of Pakistan as well, and is no satisfactory and final solution of the Minority problem in either of the two dominions. It will be like the holding of hostages in either of them for the good behaviour of the

respective majority, and will not mean the cementing of friendship, peace and goodwill between the two.

Why does he make so much of Hindu Raj today as affecting the rights and interests of Muslims in India as one country? He had not that bias against it in the past. He never expressed himself then that the new dispensation he was fighting for would eventuate in Hindu Raj. On the other hand, when any one suggested a possibility of Hindu Raj in a self-governing and United India, in order to create a split between Hindus and Muslims, he was the first to repudiate the charge and disown him. Here are his words on the subject, clear, emphatic, and beyond any possibility of equivocation. In December 1917 and, in support of the Congress League scheme and of self-government for India, Mr. Jinnah uttered from the platform of the Muslim League's annual session at Calcutta, the following words: "It is said that we are going on at a tremendous speed, that we are a minority, and that it might afterwards become a Hindu Government. I want to give an answer to that. I particularly wish to address my Muslim friends on the point. Do you think, in the first instance, as to whether it is possible that this country **could** (black ours) become a Hindu Government? Do you think that Government could be conducted by ballot-boxes? Do you think that because the Hindus are in a majority, therefore they **would** (black ours) carry out a measure in the legislative assembly and there is an end of it? If seventy

millions of Muslims do not approve of a measure which is carried by a ballot-box, do you think it can be enforced and administered in this country? Do you think that the Hindu Statesmen, with their intellect, past history, would ever think of—when they get self-government—enforcing a measure by ballot-box? Then what is there to fear? Therefore, I say to my Muslim friends not to fear. This is a bogey which is put before you by your enemies to frighten you, to scare you away, from co-operation with Hindus, which is essential for the establishment of self-government. If this country is not to be governed by the Hindus, let me tell you in the same spirit, it was not to be governed by the Muslims either, and certainly not by England. It is to be governed by the people and the sons of this country, and I, standing here—I believe I am voicing the feelings of the whole of India—say that what we demand is the immediate transfer of the substantial power of Government of this country and that is the demand of our scheme of reforms.”

This faith of his continued unshaken till the end of November 1923. Discussing the question of Indians in the Kenya colony he clinches the whole position in the following words:—“Swaraj is the only remedy for most of our grievances. Swaraj cannot be attained by representations, nor will it be ever realised so long as we remain divided. Freedom can only be attained by developing character, and habits to run in a team

(bold ours), and the determination of the people to win it." In an interview on the Kenya question Mr. Jinnah quotes the instance of Egypt and Zaglul Pasha, and concludes on the following significant note, "There was no such thing as Moderate or Extremist, liberal or Nationalist, co-operator or non-co-operator, Christian or Muslim left in Egypt when the demand became irresistible. I hope the Kenya lesson will bear some fruit and will bring about unity and co-operation between the various leaders and the people of India. On purely political basis we should declare openly that India is for Indians, and carry on the struggle for the attainment of Swaraj."

Today he stoutly maintains that Hindus must not administer Muslim provinces, and the Muslims shall not tolerate it. Speaking in the Central Legislative Assembly on the Indianisation of the Services, and in answer to the fears of Sir William Vincent who defended the manning of services by Europeans on ground of religion, Mr. Jinnah delivered himself thus, "The Hon. Member said: 'Well now, supposing you have to send men to the North West Frontier, what will be the position? If you have a Brahmin he may be very efficient as a literary man, full of knowledge.' In other words, he conveyed that a Brahmin, if he got into the Civil Service, would be nothing but a book-worm and would not be a man possessing manly qualifications. May I know what the Hon. Member

the test laid down, any test you like,—educational, physical or otherwise—why should not a Brahmin, who has passed the test, be put in charge of any province or district? Will the Hon. Member tell me that? What will happen to the N.W.F. if he goes there? The Hon. Member says, ‘Oh! the man with any property, if he was living there, would at once convert his property into a portable estate.’ If the Hon. Member is so much afraid of the Brahmin, he may be sure that the residents of N.W.F. will also obey his orders.” Mr. Jinnah was, not then alarmed by the immensity of the Indian problem. He never thought then that India being a sub-continent could not be welded into one nation. This is how he expressed himself presiding over the 16th Bombay Provincial Conference held at Ahmedabad, in October 1916. He emphatically maintained, “The Indian problem has formidable complications in its texture. If we turn to the internal situation in India, we meet with a set of social, ethnological, and cultural conditions unparalleled in recorded history. We have a vast continent inhabited by 315 millions of peoples sprung from various racial stocks, inheriting various cultures and professing a variety of religious creeds. This stupendous human group thrown together under one physical and political environment is still in the various stages of intellectual and moral growth. All this means a great divergency of outlook, purpose and endeavour. Every Indian Nationalist who has given close and anxious thought to the problem of nation-building in India, fully realises the magnitude of the

task. He is not afraid of admitting frankly that difficulties exist in his path. Such difficulties have no terrors for him. They are already vanishing before the forces which are developing in the new spirit."

We were led to quote at length from Mr. Jinnah's former utterances by the eulogy bestowed on him by one of his latter-day admirers that he was "Disraeli of Indian politics." Mr. Jinnah's friends may retort, "Has he not grown?" If from nationalism to communalism is a growth we have nothing to object. The new spirit in India that had inspired him to say that Hindu Government of India would not be a tyranny; that a Brahmin I.C.S. sent to N.W.F., had no terrors for him; that India could be welded into one nation inspite of different racial stocks, inheriting various cultures, and professing a variety of religion creeds, had either disappeared from India of 1945, or it had failed him or, shall we say, that he failed the new spirit. Perhaps Gandhism had given him a rude shock as it had given the shock to many an Indian equally great without turning him into a rank communalist. And Gandhism is not Hindu culture as the present Muslim mentality is not the culture of Islam. He should have sought to restore politics to its true level. He should have sought to rid it of pseudo-spirituality and mysticism. Mr. Jinnah, the nationalist, if he had been a far-seeing statesman, could have saved Hindus and Muslims both from the common disaster. But the lawyer and the politician that he is, he has added to the disaster by the

partitioning of India. If he had set up an independent political party to counteract the Congress, he could have saved the country from the Himalayan mistakes of Gandhian non-co-operation. But he chose to withdraw into his shell, to turn his Muslim League into the kind of Communal institution that it never was till 1928; and the instrument that he forged had split India into two. Has he followed in this the example of Zaglul Pasha which he was proud to quote as apt for India in 1923? No honest man can say that he did. Can it be said that he was following today in the footsteps of Gopal Krishna Gokhale?

However, from this digression we must revert to Mr. Jinnah as a lawyer and politician. Mr. Jinnah's legal training and acumen have enabled him to cling tenaciously to a point of view that presses itself upon his mind for the time being. A politician, for the same reason that he was a nationalist and a fierce home-ruler once, has now become a communalist and a staunch advocate of Pakistan as the only way out of the communal tangle. The difference between a legal habit of mind, joined to a narrow outlook of a politician, and true statesmanship is best brought out in the writings of Burke, and especially in his speech on Conciliation with America. Conciliation by partition may be a temporary solution. But to sunder is not the remedy for permanent peace and goodwill in a country that was territorially and physically one for ages. Much less so when we had developed the spirit of nationality under British rule. A lawyer and

politician has no qualms of conscience in advising and insisting on partition. The statesman has, for he has historical imagination, a wide and comprehensive grasp of affairs, and a wider insight into the world of tomorrow. Hence a statesman is seldom a fanatic or an impatient idealist as the lawyer, apparently weighing pros and cons, is apt to be. Here is no use for a mystic or a prophet either, or a saint, or a Moulvi. We know how the mystic and saint in India has spiritualised politics and landed Indians in a quandary. His mysticism has been the disintegration of Indian politics resulting in the dictatorship of one man in an organization of which he is not even a four anna member. Mr. Gandhi like Mr. Jinnah is also a lawyer, he presumes to be a politician, and is considered a saint. The saint, the politician and the lawyer is a strange amalgam which has been the ruin of the Congress cause of unity and freedom for the whole of India as one Union. The lawyer, the politician and the realist that Mr. Jinnah is, he has taken full advantage of the threats and the deadlocks created by the saint and the mystic, to undo the unity of India in the interest of the Muslims, and to force partition upon the Congress as the price for independence. This has cost India heavily in the end, though the Congress may lay the flattering unction to its soul that it has made the English quit India ! Had not there been Gandhism in India, there would not have been any scope whatever for the Pakistan menace in this land. It is not sound politics but the bungling in politics that is a sin. It has led to the utter misery and ruin of millions of Indian population.

phenomenon, as Gladstone was compelled to say of him. So will Mr. Jinnah go down in history as a prodigy and political phenomenon.

Mr. Jinnah, may have been an immense gain to the Muslims. He may mean an immense loss to the Hindus. But one fact is clear, that he has plunged India into chaos and terrorism the like of which it had never passed through before.

Was not Mr. Jinnah a nationalist to the core till the end of 1923? Did he not in 1927-1928 accept joint-electoralates with reservation and weightage for the minorities? Did he not plead before the All-Parties' Conference at Calcutta at the end of 1928, that if the Muslims get 33 per cent seats at the Centre he would subscribe to the Nehru Report and see that his League accepted it? The difference was only of $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 per cent. But, in spite of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's pleading before the Conference in support of Mr. Jinnah's demand, other speakers stoutly opposed it with the result that Mr. Jinnah lost at the Conference. The Muslim Conference later on turned down the Nehru Report, and Mr. Jinnah burnt his boats. Mr. Jinnah was, for some time after, a leader without followers, and his Muslim League had ceased to be a power in the country. From that time onward Mr. Jinnah ceased to be the Nationalist Leader, though he was then the President of the Muslim League, as he was between the years 1915 and 1927. He gradually changed colour as the result of acclimatisation in a new atmosphere, and after he had won his fourteen

points in favour of Muslims from Sir Samuel Hoare, the notorious framer of the Act of 1935, old Jinnah was gone and the new one became the hater of the Congress, of the Hindus along with it, and the bitterest opponent of self-government and independence for United India. The metamorphosis was complete by the end of 1939. It need not be pointed out that now he is a complete Pakistanist. That seems today for him the panacea for all political ills in India, as Charka and other social nostrums had appeared to Mr. Gandhi as the sole means of winning Swaraj between 1921-22. Nothing succeeds like success, and so the politician and lawyer in Jinnah has, at long last, won. Future years will discover how he acquits himself as the statesman of Pakistan.

VII

Mr. Jinnah as a man is a perfect gentlemen "**Sans peur et sans reproche**". He is plain-spoken and firm, as straight as a pike-staff. He will stand up for his rights as he will fight for the rights of his clients, whether the clients be in the line of his profession as a lawyer, or in the line of his mission as a politician. Politics with him is a mission and not a profession or a pose. Whatever he speaks or does for the time being, he believes it sincerely to be the wisest course. He knows no wheedling and whining. He will never stoop to conquer. Lawyer he is, but he knows not the art of finessing. He was so when he was a radical and nationalist. He is so when he has become a communalist and Pakistanist. He has a keen eye for

the weaknesses of his opponents, as he knows how to strengthen his defences. No enkindled summits of the soul for him, and no depths of dark, abysmal despair. He moves on a level, guided by the pale flame of strenuous self-possession. He will not make a confession of faith, or indulge in the "slobbery whine of maudlin sentimentality." He knows the art of masterly silence and is seldom known to betray emotion. We do not know what his latter days friends feel about him. But if the face is any index to the mind, then he is a man to inspire fear and reverence, and seldom to encourage close intimacy. His correspondence with Mr. Huque, the ex-premier of Bengal, shows how he handles men and matters. Courage, concentration and character were given by Gladstone as tests of a successful man in any walk of life not excluding public life. Courage is the superb quality in Mr. Jinnah. His hauteur, his impatience with fools, his inaccessibility on occasions, his reticence, and his refusal to wear his heart on his sleeve, are the reflex of that trait in him. At the bar and in public life, that is the one quality by which he stands out from among his associates, and contemporaries. Again, he possesses in an eminent degree the second quality indispensable for success, which is concentration. He is no "universal adviser" on all things under the sun. He has no "Morrison Pills" to sell except one. He does not believe in having too many irons in the fire. He is no encyclopaedist. Whatever fire he has in his he does not let it be choked by putting too much fuel on it.

“Waste not, want not”—that is his motto, not as regards money, for he is no ascetic or miser in that sphere but as regards the talents, the energy, the fire that are his god-given gifts. And the last of these is character—a completely fashioned will, the nerve to reject, and public character. In that respect Mr. Jinnah is impeccable. None can wheedle him into acquiescence by holding out a bait to him. Title, rank, designation he will simply brush aside, and will not let them interfere with the line of action he has marked out for himself. In his public utterances as in private conversation he will never mince matters but will call a spade a spade. He never wastes his words, knows not to indulge in barren verbiage—the tinsel clinking coin of compliment, and never equivocates. He will ever respect a straight forward man, and does not tolerate a man beating about the bush. He brooks no rival near the throne and does not suffer fools gladly. Certainly, he has gathered satellites about him in his recent phase, but he knows that they are satellities and knows when to cut them. He has the minimum of body to go upon but has the spirit in him to cow down a bully. “No coward soul is his.”

One instance of his heftiness and sang-froid will here suffice. The occasion was in the year 1922 or 1923. A meeting was held to support R. P. Paranjpye as a candidate in the ensuing election to the Bombay Council. The place of the meeting was the hall on the groundfloor of the Marwadi Vidyalaya in Bombay.

forthwith. But Mr. Jinnah, as President of the meeting, stood firm like a rock. He decided that the meeting should continue, whatever happened, till the business for which it was convened, had been finished. He knew who was the ring-leader and how the man in front of him and the persons placed in the hall were merely carrying out his instructions. He bore it all with patience, but after rowdism had reached a point, he rushed forward, collared the man, and got him ejected from the hall by his chauffeur. In a moment the scene changed and the meeting ended successfully. A police-constable entered the hall in the meanwhile to ask if the meeting needed his help. He was a European Officer who was told straight by the president to clear off, as he did not want him there. Those who witnessed the scene could not but praise the remarkable tact, firmness and cool courage of Mr. Jinnah, the nationalist, in handling the meeting and finishing the work for which it was called. And this is not the only instance of its kind.

The Muslim League session on the Marine Lines in 1915 is another instance in point. This is given because the writer was an eye-witness to the scene and can recall many faces at the meeting marked by panic, scare and distress. Mr. Jinnah was the only man among them who did not lose his temper and who seemed determined to ride the storm and he did ride it, and Paranjpye thanked him for it. He did not utter an angry word, he gave a long rope to the opposition in the meeting, he answered every question that was

asked and turned the tables upon the questioners, among whom the writer clearly recalls a person named Mr. Kaderbhoy; the agents were silenced, the ring-leader was foiled, and the meeting proved a triumph for the conveners. That showed the strength of character of the public man that is Mr. Jinnah at his best. Courage, concentration and an unimpeachable public character, these were the qualities that enabled him then to dominate the scene, and have enabled him in recent years to recreate and consolidate an organisation that, since 1928, was no more than a name and was "attenuated to an aspect" by internal rivalries and divisions, and that became such a formidable power in the country and a rival to the Congress that it could not ignore, much less wipe out, with all the boast of the Mahatma, the satellites, the High Command and the millions behind it. The Congress in Office, the Congress out of office, and the Congress in office again as an Interim Government have made no difference to Mr. Jinnah. His steam-roller has moved on straight and firm on the road marked out for it by the driver and the engineer. A fact to which it is no use shutting our eyes like the proverbial osterich, however bitter it may be to us as Indians. One only regrets that Mr. Jinnah should only have given to party, sect and community what was meant for mankind in India. We lost him for India, they won him for Muslims. What history will adjudge, let us not try to judge or anticipate. We are studying a character which, with all its faults, is great, and which one cannot fail to admire, even if

we hate it for the time being. For is not hatred itself but the inverted form of love?

Mr. Jinnah dominates not by learning, not by eloquence, not by intrigue and speciousness, not by Government favour and flattery, but by the kind of public character he possesses. If only leaders of the stamp of Gokhale and Tilak were in our midst they would not have, perhaps, allowed matters to drift, and Mr. Jinnah to become the kind of communal leader that he is today—one who refuses to listen, one who makes his own followers believe that the Hindus led by the Congress are not friends, and that Hindu-Muslim Unity can be on no other basis than on the abject surrender by the Congress to whatever he lays down as the just demands of his co-religionists. He has consistently spread in the country and outside the belief that short of this Muslims will not be safe in India and their existence as citizens was jeopardised, and that the Congress supports the Hindus and lets down the Muslims, and that though its doors are open to all, the peculiar cult known as Gandhism and its adoption and practice by the great national organization had changed it into caste-Hindu organization, pure and simple. Right or wrong he has succeeded in making it a sentiment of the Muslim masses. Hence all the trouble and the futility of pour parlers with Mr. Jinnah with a view to give and take, and for fair rational compromise.

He who refused on the Congress platform to refer to Ali Brothers as Maulanas, he who is secular to the

core, he who had lived all along and lives today in tip-top European style, swears today by Islamic culture, asserts that nothing short of Pakistan can satisfy the Muslims of India. He appears at public meetings and addresses mass meetings today in Urdu and wearing a fez and a sherwani to prove to them that he is a "double-distilled" Mussalman. We may not doubt his sincerity of purpose and courage of conviction. But we must say of him comparing his public life before 1928 with his life from 1939 to this day, that though it has gained immensely in popularity and hero-worship among his coreligionist, it will not rank so high in the estimation of those whose opinion counts in the long run more than the applause of "that grotesque, hudibrastic crew"—the multitude, of the so called public opinion which is no better than "a drunken man on horseback." The Congress leaders realised it the day before yesterday, as the Muslim League leader will realise it the day after tomorrow. In the meanwhile the country, which is greater than both, has suffered.

VIII

From 1945 onwards Mr. Jinnah has been busy putting spokes in the wheel of India's freedom. The process had begun much earlier, in fact, from 1930 onwards, when from the presidential chair of the Muslim League session at Allahabad Sir Mahumad Iqbal categorically declared that "to base a constitution on the conception of a homogeneous India or to apply to India the principles dictated by British

democratic sentiments, is unwittingly to prepare her for a civil War." He further maintained that "the construction of a policy on national lines, if it meant displacement of Islamic principles of solidarity, was simply unthinkable to a Muslim." He added that he had no hesitation in declaring that if the principle that the Indian Muslim was entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homelands was recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he would be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India." And what did he suggest as means to achieve this idea? Here are his words: "Communalism in its higher aspects was indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India. The Muslim demand for the creation of Muslim India within India was perfectly justified. He wanted to see the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single Muslim state and that self-government within the British Empire or without it, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to be the final destiny of Muslims, at least of North-West India."

In this declaration one finds the germs of Pakistan. Iqbal did not then think of including Sindh and Bengal in "that single Muslim state." But the appetite grows by what it feeds on. And it was but natural that the Pakistanist cum Pan-Islamist should later on think of annexing Sindh and Bengal to Iqbal's

conception of a "North-West Indian Muslim State." Iqbal was confident that the creation of such a state "would eventually solve the problem of India as well as of Asia." In a book written by Edward Thompson in 1939, we find reported a conversation between the author and Sir Mohamed Iqbal on this subject. Iqbal then denied totally that he had approved of Pakistan and he admitted that the division of India would be the ruination of India and of Muslims and Hindus of India. But the quotation that we have given here is enough for us, and it shows clearly that Jinnah's insistence on Pakistan was not entirely the result of the Congress administration of the provinces in its charge during the years 1937 and 1939.

To do Iqbal justice he had visualised federation between the two states for common purposes. But Jinnah knocked federation on the head in the Imperial Legislative Assembly, and roped in the Congress members to accept provincial autonomy in the Act of 1935. The reason that he gave then for his attitude was that it was 90 per cent autocracy. But the real motive behind it was that, given provincial autonomy without federal government at the centre, it was easier for him to carve Pakistan out of India and to buttress his two-nation's theory. From the declaration of August 1940 he is persistent in his demand that any change that may be contemplated by British Government in favour of India shall wait for its approval upon the decision of the Muslim League by which he meant the Muslims in India. And he began

harping constantly upon the differences between the two major communities and made light of the ties that had bound them to each other. As if he did not know these differences, or as if they did not exist at the time he was an ardent nationalist, and as if the ties are not there today, because Mr. Jinnah chooses to shut his eyes to them. Why Mr. Jinnah jettisoned Federal Government at the centre, is made clear to us by anticipation in the speech of Iqbal from which we have already quoted. Here are his words: "The truth of the matter is that the participation of Indian princes, among whom only a few are Muslims, in a federation scheme, serves a double purpose. On the one hand, it serves as an all-important factor in maintaining British power in India practically as it is. On the other hand, it gives an overwhelming majority to Hindus in an all-India Federal Assembly. In other words it seems to be a kind of understanding between Hindu India and British Imperialism. You perpetuate me in India and I, in turn, give you a Hindu oligarchy to keep all other communities in perpetual subjection. If Muslims silently agree to any such scheme it will simply hasten their end as a political entity in India."

In 1930 no one dreamt, and no one has dreamt since, of creating Hindu oligarchy in India by the help of British Imperialism to keep all other communities in perpetual subjection. On the other hand, if it may be fairly alleged, though it may not be true, that, with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery at their

back, the Muslims in India led by Mr. Jinnah were out to torpedo self-government for India, if it did not mean that the Muslim minority were not given a whip-hand in it over the Hindu majority at the Centre. Either have a union of India in which the majority community is *defacto* reduced to the position of a minority at the centre, or divide India into two, leaving Indian India out of the picture. From 1937 to 1945 Mr. Jinnah's moves on the chessboard of politics were directed to humiliate the Congress, and to prevent India from coming into her own. In the event, he has proved not only the antagonist of the Congress but of the whole of India minus the Musulmans.

IX

During the Viceroyalty of Lord Willingdon in India, Mr. Jinnah decided not to return to India but to practice his profession in the Privy Council in England. As his biographer has put it, he hoped to "fight India's battle in England." It was not, indeed, India's battle he was out to fight but the battle of the Muslims to checkmate the progress of India. During his absence from India the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim Conference demanded that no Constitution for India should be framed without the previous settlement of the Hindu-Muslim problem; that the Federal Structure as envisaged by the Round Table Conference was unsatisfactory and should be improved; and, further, that the London Conference should be boycotted by the Mussulmans, in case their

political aspirations were not fully met. Maulana Hasrat Mohani at the time, made it plain as daylight what the Conference aimed at. He declared that the Hindus were out for Hindu Raj, and their vigorous insistence on the principle of democracy of the Western type was nothing but a cloak to hide their real sentiment of perpetuating the political power of Hindus to the utter detriment of Muslims and the minorities. At that time, it has to be remembered, Mr. Gandhi and the Congress had not come into the picture of the Round Table Conference. All other delegates were not averse to the Muslim demand of reservation of seats and safeguards. Ramsay Macdonald's government, as the result of the deliberations, had merely prepared the frame-work of responsible government for Federated India. The question of the minorities was not settled but postponed. How could then the Muslim Conference charge, and Hasrat Mohani declare that the Hindus were out for Hindu Raj in India to the utter detriment of Muslims and the minorities? But that was preparing the ground, surely and slowly, to force the British government to concede Jinnah's fourteen points to the Muslim. As the turn of events had it, when Gandhi went to England to attend the 2nd R.T.C. as the sole representative of the Congress, and, ridiculously enough, as the sole representative of India, the Labour Government had gone out of office, and the so-called national government had taken its place in England with Sir Samuel Hoare as the Secretary of State of India.

With Samuel Hoare as the Secretary of State for India we know what Mr. Gandhi lost for India, and what Mr. Jinnah won for the Muslims. The Aga Khan got a blank cheque from Mr. Gandhi for the Muslims; the cheque, presented to Sir Samuel Hoare, got him better terms for Muslims; the minority Committee broke up, the minorities pact was made, and Ramsay Macdonald was given the power to settle the question out of court. The result was the Communal Award and a government at the Centre worse in many vital points than that implemented by the Act of 1919. "Responsibility in the provinces with irresponsibility at the centre was fraught with disaster"—that was the verdict of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, long before any one had an inkling of Lionel Curtis's diarchy with the misfit of autocracy at the centre. And when full responsibility in the Centre and the Federal Government visualised in the Act of 1935 vanished into thin air, the field was clear for the Muslims to shout out for a separate Muslim State, though the plan was hatched long before, as we have noticed, in the speech of Sir Mohamed Iqbal.

The war and the resignation of the Congress Ministries in the provinces was, indeed, the day of deliverance for the Muslims. For it was the day of delivery for the child that, in eight years time, had grown into full-fledged Pakistan, with its parent as the first Governor-General of that dominion under the authority of King George of England who is also King George of Pakistan, at least from the 15th of

August 1947 to the end of June 1948. If there was misgovernment and maltreatment in the Congress provinces there was misgovernment and maltreatment in the Muslim League Provinces as well. And if Muslims had really suffered in the former, the Hindus had no less suffered in the latter. As such it was no use holding up the Congress Raj as Hindu Raj any more than it was useful holding up the League Raj as Muslim Raj. The people were one, the political cliques and cabals sought to divide them, and they had triumphed by the mistakes of both to the utter humiliation of India. The events subsequent to August 15, have shown clearly enough where we are under the Muslim Raj in Pakistan, as regards law and order; and as regards security of life and property to the minorities in that dominion.

The year 1937, was indeed, critical in the political history of India. The Congress had won the elections as the Muslim League had won them through the special Muslim electorates. Flushed with victory over all other political parties in the country, which were only the rump of their former selves for the reason that the Government in power, taking them to be incapable of delivering the goods had slighted them, and secondly for the fact that, throughout the country, the Congress slogans had triumphed over common sense and reason, and, in themselves they had failed to organise and were without virile and outstanding leadership, the Congress flouted all, and went its way in the formation of ministries without

regard for what the minority most concerned in them thought of that policy. Jawaharlal Nehru refused to recognise any other party in the country as worth his notice, nay, even as beneath his contempt. He declared that "the parties that mattered in India were the Congress and the British, and others should line up with the Congress if they intended to survive." The Congress had declared that it had accepted office not to work the Reform Act of 1935, but to wreck the constitution from within. It had indeed, helped Mr. Jinnah, who scored a triumph over it in the Central Legislature, to reject the Federal part of it, and it had opined about the communal award that it neither rejected nor accepted it, whatever that might mean.

The Congress ministries were working the Constitution all right, and had won encomiums from the Governors and the bureaucracy that they had done capitally well! Its twenty-seven months' administration of the provinces in its charge had antagonised every other interest in the country, and the hardest hit, as they believed it, were the Muslim minority represented by the Muslim League, and the Scheduled classes. The Congress Ministries went on as if they were entrenched in office for all time to come, and they recked not what they did, and what others thought of their high-handed administration. They had forgotten the essence of political and parliamentary democracy that the opposition counts and must be given its due weight in the consideration

of every momentous issue. Basis education, prohibition, enforcement of Hindustani, the exclusion from the ministries of Muslims represented by the Muslim League, property taxation, so on and so forth, were the sins of omission and commission they perpetrated during the regime. And, gradually, they were loosening the stones of the foundation on which the Indian National Congress had built up its progress and well-deserved popularity. The Congress had ceased to focuss public opinion in its pure spirit. It was proud to proclaim that the opinion of the High Command, the Zone dictators, and of the man behind them, was the opinion of the public at large all over the country. The bitter fruit, for the reaping, of this policy was slow in coming; but it did come at long last in the opposition of the Muslim League and Mr. Jinnah, to whom it had to truckle from this time onward for conciliation and for united Indian front during the period of the war from 1939 to 1945. The chicken had come home to roost and the reckoning had to be made.

Mr. Jinnah's answer to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru must be noted here. He said, "there is a third party, namely, the Mussalmans. We are not going to be dictated to by anybody. We are willing to co-operate with any group of a progressive and independent character provided its programme and policy correspond to our own. We are willing to work as equal parties for the welfare of India." Jinnah's contention, subsequently, and it was a right contention, was that

“it is no use encouraging Muslims to come into the fold of the Congress for the sake of a prize.” In Bombay we know who was the Muslim included in the Cabinet by the High Command of the Congress. The Congress would have gained and not lost in prestige if it had appointed to the posts or post in its Cabinets, Muslims of Mr. Jinnah’s choice. Coalition does not mean the surrender of party-principles, but “co-operation with the Congress in its constructive programme on a national and patriotic ground”, which Mr. Jinnah was willing to offer at the time. All the differences would then have vanished as the result of actual work of administration, and the situation would not have worsened as it did worsen by 1939, and enmity would not have sharpened between Mr. Jinnah who is the Muslim League and the Congress camarilla of the High Command. The Pakistan ideal adumbrated in 1930 by Sir Mohamed Iqbal would then have died of inanition for the soil would have been rendered unfit for the nurture and growth of the reactionary ideal. Instead of winning over Mr. Jinnah in an honest and straightforward manner, the Congress president Mr. Nehru chalked out a Muslim mass contact scheme to wipe out Mr. Jinnah. Mr. Jinnah remained unperturbed, but Iqbal was goading him on, as the latter’s correspondence published in the ‘official’ biography of Mr. Jinnah makes it but too clear, to take up a position of an out-out-rupture with the Congress, and to stand, finally and firmly, for a separate Muslim State in India. Here are Iqbal’s

words: "The Congress president derides the political existence of Muslims in no unmistakable terms. The other political body i.e., the Mahasabha, whom I regard as the real representative of the masses of the Hindus, has declared more than once that a united Hindu-Muslim Nation is impossible in India. In these circumstances it is obvious that the only way to a peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of racial, linguistic and religious affinities. Many British statesmen also realise this. I remember Lord Lothian told me before I left England, that my scheme was the only possible solution of the troubles of India, but that it would take 25 years to come. I agree with you that our community is not yet sufficiently organised and disciplined. But I feel that it would be highly advisable for you to indicate in your address at least the line of action that the Muslims of North-West India would be finally driven to take." And the same Sir Mohamed Iqbal is reported to have disowned such a redistribution—now called division—Pakistan—as detrimental to Hindus and Muslims in India, to Edward Thompson by the end of 1939 ! Iqbal clarifies the matter still further, as follows:—"To my mind the new constitution with its idea of a single Federation is completely hopeless. A separate Federation of Muslim Provinces, re-formed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-

determination just as other nations in India and outside India are?" The biographer of Jinnah admits "that these letters of Iqbal have exercised influence on the mind of Mohamed Ali Jinnah." Subsequent history has shown what that influence was and whither it had led him.

It was in the Muslim League session at Lucknow in 1937 that Mr. Jinnah announced his own policy for the Muslims. He asked pointedly, "does wrecking mean working?" The Muslim League, he avers, stands for full national democratic self-government for India. He warns the Muslims against playing into the hands of hostile groups. He repudiates paper declarations, slogans, shibboleths and phrases used for the consumption of the ignorant and illiterate masses. About the Congress asseveration of Purna Swaraj or complete independence he remarks "it is no use having complete independence on your lips and the Government of India Act of 1935 in your hands." And then he makes the positive statement "what India requires is a complete united front and honesty of purpose and then by whatever name you call your government is a matter of no consequence so long as it is a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

With the letters of Iqbal at the back of his mind, he yet refrains from expressing himself on the division of India into two nation states. He still talks of united front, and "of full national, democratic self-government for India", as the stand of the Muslim

League. He only complains against the "Congress action that "any individual Musulman member who was willing to unconditionally surrender and sign their pledge was offered a job as a minister and was passed off as a Muslim Minister, although he did not command the confidence or the respect of an overwhelming majority of the Musulman representatives in the Legislature." But the Congress, on the strength of the vote behind it in the country, had dealt out the same fate to Hindus; it had set up and brought into the Legislatures Hindu candidates who would not have been returned by any honest and un-influenced electorate to the legislature as their representatives. This method was in full evidence in Maharashtra and in Bombay during the first elections under the Act of 1935. The Congress High Command then boasted that whomsoever they chose to set up shall be returned whether he was or was not intrinsically worthy of the job. And what it did in setting up and supporting candidates, it only improved upon, in choosing the Ministers for the Cabinets in the provinces under its rule. It was because the electorates let themselves be imposed upon by the objective of the Congress bid for power, that they became nonentities in shaping the policies and the administrative acts of the Congress Ministries during the subsequent period of twenty-seven months of Congress rule.

The separate, communal electorates for the Muslims saved them, no doubt, from such dupery and influence. But it made Mr. Jinnah, more and more,

recede from his position as the champion of "full, national, democratic self-government for India", and go completely into the arms of Muslims of bitter communalistic bias like Sir Mohamed Iqbal, and to slide down the inclined slope of communalism into that poet's idea of an independent North-West Muslim Indian State with Bengal as a later addition to it. He talked of united front of India, but the front that he created was a Muslim front in bitter antagonism not only to the Congress front but, in the event, to India as a whole. Was it a national front or a communal front, was it democracy or dictatorship, was it an appeal to reason, or full exploitation of illiteracy and ignorance of the Muslim masses; was it or was it not the creation of Muslim oligarchy to brow-beat the Hindu oligarchy? Was it with or without the help of British Imperialism that he had won in the game? What is the use of the pot calling the kettle black? The kettle was black indeed, but the pot should have been kept clean. Perhaps, it could not be, and Mr. Jinnah was himself helpless afterwards to control himself, and to control those who had backed him.

He began, since the Lucknow session of 1937, to harp too much upon the 'Zulum' of the Congress, for he wanted a cry to set up a solid phalanx of blind and ignorant supporters behind him. As his biographer tells us he drew the attention of his audience to burning questions like the enforcement of Hindi, **Bande Mataram**, and the Congress flag, and explained how the "Hindu Governments were influencing all and sundry to obey their mandates in

these regards." One who reads the published correspondence between Mr. Jinnah and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru beginning on January 18, 1938 and ending on December 16, 1939, will see for himself how the Pandit has answered every point in the allegations made by Mr. Jinnah in regard to these "burning questions", and in regard to many other issues that had divided the Muslim League and the Congress. While we may grant that the Congress had erred, it also tried its best from that date to repair its errors, and to win Mr. Jinnah and his League over to the Congress, in order to create a united national front in the face of the situation that was to overwhelm India. We may conclude this portion with the final appeal of Pandit Nehru to Mr. Jinnah in a letter dated December 16, 1939, in which he says "May I say again that no one in our behalf, so far as I know, challenges or minimises the authority, influence and importance of the Muslim League. It is for this reason that we have been eager to discuss matters with it and to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problems that confront us. Unfortunately we never seem to reach even the proper discussion of these problems as various hurdles and obstructions, in the shape of conditions precedent, come in our way. These conditions precedent, as I have ventured to point out to you, have far-reaching significance. I do not know why they should be allowed to obstruct all progress or prevent us from considering these problems. It should not be difficult to remove these hurdles and come to grips with the subject

itself. But as these hurdles continue and others are added to them, I am compelled to think that the real difficulty is the difference in political outlook and objective." Mr. Jinnah had become by the time the most obstinate man, and the stern dictator to the Congress. The more they approached him, pleaded with him, and sought to flatter him, the more stiff-necked he appears in his replies to them, and, in the end, he would not budge an inch from his position that first they must accept the principle of Pakistan, and then come to discuss other matters. No amount of pourparlers, negotiations, discussions, and abject petitioning, have been able to convince him that truth and right may not be all on his side, and error and wrong entirely on the side of those who had approached him "with bated breath and in whispering humbleness" to settle the Hindu-Muslim question in the best interest of India as a whole.

XI.

From this time onward Mr. Jinnah took upon himself the role of the defender of Muslims in India, making the claim that the Muslim League alone represented them on the political stage. And as the result of appropriating that right he showed up the Indian National Congress as a Caste-Hindu organization, and demanded from Mr. Gandhi, whenever the latter had gone to him for finding out a *via media* between the Congress and the League in order to resolve the political tangle, that he would talk to him only as representing Caste-Hindus. The

scheduled class he would exclude just to win them over to his side, but, as events proved it, that ruse had failed. Looking to the present attitude of Dr. Ambedkar one cannot say that Mr. Jinnah had succeeded in inducing them to walk into his parlour, any more than he had succeeded in bringing the Sikh community on the side of the Musulmans. He may have destroyed the Unionist party and its government in the Punjab, but he did not succeed in setting up there the Ministry of the Muslim League. And his fond dream of annexing the whole of Punjab, the whole of Bengal and, possibly, the whole of Assam to the Pakistan territory, had failed to materialise. No doubt, India has suffered by the partition, but the Pakistan, that he has achieved by obstinacy and hard bargaining, is no less truncated and moth-eaten Pakistan on that account. The Congress has lost in its aim of winning independence along with United India. The Muslim League has won against the Congress; but it had won much less than it had started to achieve by upsetting the Cabinet mission plan of May 16.

How did Mr. Jinnah prove that the Congress was purely a Hindu body? By the following rhetorical flourish before the Muslim League session at Patna at the end of December 1938. He said then, "I challenge any one to deny that the Congress is nothing but a Hindu body. That is the truth and the Congress Leaders know it. The presence of the few Muslims—the few misled and misguided ones and the

few who are there with ulterior motives—does not, cannot make it a national body. I challenge anybody to deny that the Congress is a Hindu body. I ask, does the Congress represent the Muslims? I ask, does it represent the Christians? I ask, does the Congress represent the non-Brahmins? I say that Congress does not even represent all the Hindus. What about the Hindu Mahasabha and the Liberal Federation? The Congress is no doubt the largest single party in the country. But it is nothing more than that. It may arrogate to itself whatever title it likes; the Congress High Command, in the intoxication of power like persons who are drunk, may make any claims it pleases them to make. But such claims cannot alter the true character of the Congress. It remains what it is—mainly a Hindu body.”

This fierce diatribe does not turn the Congress into a communal organization. None of the institutions Mr. Jinnah has mentioned will give it that name. There may be sharp differences between the Hindu Mahasabha and the Congress, but on that account the Sabha will not brand it with that name. It blames the Congress for pampering too much the Muslims at the expense of the Hindus, and for letting down Hindu interests to serve the Mahatma. Neither the scheduled castes nor the non-Brahmins, nor the liberal Federation will subscribe to Mr. Jinnah's description of the Congress as a Hindu body. Nor will they recognise the narrow, bigoted, communal

body that the Muslim League is today, as serving national ends better than the Congress.

And if the Hindu Mahasabha represents the Hindus, why should Mr. Jinnah have abstained from settling the Hindu-Muslim question with it and then settling the political issue as between the British Government, the Congress, and all other communal bodies grouped together. Who was the Congress to sanction the division of India, who was the Muslim League to appropriate the territory to itself, and how was the British Government justified in deciding the matter as if the Congress and the League were the only two legatees in this business?

Mr. Jinnah named so many parties, bodies and institutions to prove that the Congress was not Indian and National. It was a handy stick for him to beat the Congress with. Otherwise, he has attacked the Liberal Federation and the Hindu Mahasabha as fiercely and recklessly as the Congress itself. And if the Congress is the largest single party in the country and nothing more than that, what else is the Muslim League vis a vis the other political institutions representing Muslim interests in India? And still he claims stridently that it alone and no other Muslim body shall represent and speak for the Muslims of India. For the same reason, the Indian National Congress can claim to speak and represent the whole of India on political settlement. Its claim was questioned from 1885 to 1888 to speak for India by the foreign bureaucracy which twitted it with the

appellation of "microscopic minority". Even then it included less Christians, less Parsis, less Musulmans and other communities. And when Mr. Jinnah came into the Congress and was also a member of the Muslim League, the case was not different. The Congress was overwhelmingly Hindu then as it is now, though its leadership was in the hands of those who, whether they were, by birth or religion, Parsis, Christians and Muslims, were proud to own themselves as Indians, and Mr. Jinnah was one of them. Hence to dub the Congress today, merely to serve Pakistanic ends, as a Hindu body, mainly Hindu body, is an injustice to that great National Institution.

Mr. Gandhi, indeed, from 1920 onwards, against the stern warning of Dadabhai Naoroji in 1886, and of Telang later, did involve the Congress in religious and social questions special to the Hindu Community like, for instance, the removal of untouchability and the admission of the depressed classes to Hindu temples. He involved that body in Khilafat agitation peculiar only to Islam. He took up the question of prohibition which should have been taken up by a separate conference, and of Swadeshi which was a matter for the Industrial and Economic Conferences to tackle and to solve, and, worst of it all, he made the solution of these questions. But from this miscellaneous bundle of ill-assorted things the Hindu community had to suffer more than the community of Islam. The high-handedness of Gandhism made

the caste Hindus suffer more than any one else. And the confusion, that these matters had worse confounded, had given the rulers a convenient handle to beat the Congress itself, and to postpone the day of India's deliverance. Should Mr. Jinnah have helped the British authorities, wittingly or unwittingly, by refusing to have anything to do with the Congress until it had first subscribed itself as a purely Caste-Hindu Organization?

XII.

In an interview to the representative of an American Newspaper in November 1945, Mr. Jinnah is reported to have said as follows: He said, "The Congress leaders spoke of unity and brotherhood with Muslims in a United India, but they would not eat our food, and if a Hindu shakes hands with a Muslim, he would wash his hands thereafter. We are different in everything, we differ in our religion, our civilisation and culture, and our history, our language, our architecture, our music, jurisprudence and laws, our food, our society, our dress—in every way we are different. We can't get together in the ballot-box."

A strange tirade this against the Hindus, and against United India, when Hindus and Muslims have lived together as brothers for centuries in India, without the latter being ever persecuted for these differences by their Hindu brethren under whatever dynasty they may be living as subjects of a common sovereign. They have lived together,

worked together, and grown together as children of the soil. The occasional quarrels between them did not interfere with their friendly intercourse and comradeship in normal times. The Hindu and Muslim masses in India on the village side and in the country, could not be distinguished, one from the other, in their normal life, for the simple reason, if for no other, that the Muslims in India are converts from the Hindu fold either by decent or directly. As the cowl does not make a monk mere change of religion does not change the habits of generations in family and social life. These villagers on the country side dress in the same fashion in the lower strata of society. The difference, if there was any, prevails in towns and cities and capitals of India. And now more than at any other time, because the communal spirit and differences are being sedulously spread and fostered among them.

The Muslim spoke in the language of the village, of the district and of the taluka towns of the provinces, where they had settled and lived for generations. In Gujerat he spoke Gujerati, in Cutch Mandvi Cutchi, in Maharashtra villages—Konkani and Marathi. The Bohri and the Khoja speaks the tongue of Gujerat, according to its variations among the Gujerathi Brahmins and the Bhatias. The Memons speak Cutchi and they are seldom found to indulge in Hindustani or Urdu in Western India. In the North all speak Hindustani—Muslims and Hindus both. Only their script varies. If the cowl does not

make a monk, it is not the dress that necessarily makes a Muslim. All Mohamedans do not have a beard or wear Fez. Nay, all Hindus today do not don a dhoti, put a tilak on their forehead, or have the tuft of hair—grow shendi—as a mark of Hinduism. It is sheer cussedness to say today that when a Hindu shakes hands with a Muslim he washes his hands afterwards. Untouchability in that form does not survive today in towns and cities, and even in the province, without exception, between a Hindu and a depressed class man. When did Mr. Jinnah witness this and on what scale? Do his Hindu friends, one thinks he still has many among them—wash their hands after touching him? Have they objected to lunch or dine with him? In old, old days there was a storm in the tea cup when the report had gone abroad that Mr. Daji Abaji Khare had dined with Mr. Budrudin Tyabji. But Khare never made a secret of it and was not excommunicated on that account from the Brahmin Community.

What does Mr. Jinnah mean by “our food”—meat or vegetable? The Brahmin, as a rule, is a vegetarian and does not take meat, while a non-Brahmin has no objection to it. Are they not on that account, brothers of one another? Can they not be good citizens together of United India? Let Mr. Jinnah look around him a bit, let him visit the simple folk on the country-side—the farmer, the shop-keeper and the artizan. Let him see what they eat, let him enquire if they treat one another as

untouchables on the grounds of difference in food, drink and dress and even religion, till they are inflamed by mischievous bands from outside. What do these men in 700,000 villages of India know of your civilization and culture, your architecture, your music, that, you say, divide the Muslims from the Hindus? Where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise. And the Nation dwells in its villages over which the sophistry of town politics comes like an invasion. These simple folk with their quiet simple ways form the bulk of the Indian population among whom the difference between the Muslim and the Hindu is not, except when they pray in a mosque or a temple, which prayer ought to teach them that before God and man they are one. They are not right who, living in cities and boasting of their western education, yet point to differences in law and jurisprudence in order to conclude that, for these differences, they cannot vote in the same ballot-box.

XIII.

What were they doing so far in the Municipal elections, and in elections to the legislatures before 1909? Had they then learnt to dine together, dress similarly, and merge their civilization, culture and religion into one united whole? Carlyle says all unconsciousness is health, all consciousness is disease. It is surely no sign of health in the Muslim leaders to be conscious of their separate civilisation, separate music, architecture and form of dress, and to maintain, "in every way we are different"

and, therefore, we cannot vote in the same ballot-box; we must separate in political and national life, forgetting the lesson of history that a common political and national life is itself the solvent of separatist tendencies, and ultimately builds up the strength and influence of communities who work in a common cause.

Surely, Mr. Jinnah did not discover these differences, much less did he emphasize them, in 1915 and 1916, and did not think that the two communities could not coalesce and work for a common objective, and could never be brought together to vote in a common ballot-box. Either something was wrong with him then or something is wrong with him now. Obviously he had become ego-centric which he was not then. And that is not a sign of political sanity and political health, least of all, of political wisdom. And what does Mr. Jinnah know of history? Muslims in India have no different history from the history of their Hindu brethren. For the Muslims here today were once Hindus—bulk of them—who were converted to Islam by Mohamedan rulers as the Portuguese converted the Hindus of Goa to Christianity. The story of conversion is a dark chapter in Indian history and its pages were not written by the Hindu Rajahs or Hindu mystics and saints, or by Hindu priests.

The Secretary of the Muslim League says that his co-religionists ruled India for eight hundred years. When did Mohamed of Gazni invade India? When

did the Lodis and Taghlaks rule India?—let us know. When did Eabar invade India and establish his Mogul rule at Delhi, coming for that purpose from far-off Samarkand? Who were the rulers of India till 1526? It was the establishment of Mogul rule in India that began a new epoch in Indian History—not only an epoch of conquest, rapine and loot—but of the influences of one form of civilisation upon another, a glowing picture of the happy fusion being given us by that great seer, statesman and constructive thinker of India, Mahadeo Govind Ranade, in his monumental address before the Indian Social Conference at Lucknow in 1899.

The Sufi Saints of Islam were the first to penetrate and influence the culture of India in its spiritual aspect and they were influenced in their turn by the culture of the Hindus. And out of this mutual influence grew the healthy thought which brought about a deeper unity between the Hindu and the Muslim masses of India, of which the educated modern Muslim, any more than the educated modern Hindu, has no idea. Politics has so much warped the one and twisted the other, that this fundamental unity is lost sight of in the Indian world of today. The fakir, the dervish and the saint in India, apart from the obscurantist priest on either side, helped this fusion and fomented no quarrel. They never fought with one another on the ground of Hinduism and Mohomedanism. On the other hand, they realised that what the Muslim described as Allah, the Hindu

called Parameshwara. Rama and Rahim were one and the same, as Kabir put it and Nanak enforced it. The worship of Krishna was common to both—the Suffi and the Vaishnava saint. Poems on Krishna are written by Suffi Saints, and the Hindu Saint worshipped the idol as realising the invisible behind the visible, and did not hate the Suffi. And there was large-hearted toleration and charity between the two. The Hindu and the Muslim lived as good neighbours. There was not such a sharp division among them as between the Hindus and the untouchables in Hindu society. The Rajput and the Mogul mixed and moved together, imitated each other's dress and, in the days of Akbar, went even further in unity and co-mingling, as we may know if we study our history aright. And those were days of superstition and not of enlightenment, of pure oriental learning or no learning. But common sense and realism made them come together while today our illuminationist shouts from the house tops that "the twain shall never meet."

XIV.

It was the institution of caste carried to its absurd length that had proved the bane of Hindu society by imposing suicidal restrictions on inter-dining and inter-marriage between the thousand and one castes, and between many more sub-castes which divide the Hindu household at the present moment. But caste does not interfere in the cordial and intimate relationship between a Hindu and a Muslim, and had not sharply divided Hindus and Mussulmans in

politics and the ballot-box till 1909. And, if we permit ourselves to express the naked truth, caste still divides the convert Christian and the convert Muslim, for superstition and social habits of countless generations die hard inspite of change in religion. Caste may have slackened among them as regards commonfood, but still persists, in spite of the absence of taboos in the new society, as regards the choice in marriage, as we know, among India Christians and Indian Mussulmans. But it is impolitic and unwise to pursue the point further, for the sociologist knows that customs of centuries will not topple down like a house of cards at the flourish of the reformer's trumpet.

If an orthodox Hindu will not touch the food given him by a Muslim, it is because he will not touch the food prepared for him out of the ring-fence of his own narrow caste. But whatever the *Jamat* or the caste may decide, the Hindus as a whole are all reformers now, and they have no objection to interdining with Muslims at any public function, or in a club, or in private gatherings. Why, then, make so much of what is fast disappearing under the impact of the West in the cities, towns and capitals of India? Is it wise to perpetuate social differences by dividing society politically? Would it not have been wiser to seek to obliterate them by fusing the communities for political action? As Gokhale put it long ago politics is the **primum mobile** of all action in India and division in politics affects

detrimentally all other pursuits of life. We witness in India today the worst exhibition of this fact. We hope, now that the political frame-work is complete, the picture in it will be painted and filled in to sink, rather than to emphasise the antagonism between the two great communities of India, not only politically but socially as well.

XV.

The Hindu in the far-off villages still makes a vow at the Mohamedan shrine and did participate, till recently, in the Mohorum festival. And the Muslim had no objection to dance and share in the Hindu Yatras and festivities. There are shrines of Muslim saints where the chaddar on the grave at the annual celebration is spread by the Muslim and flowers placed by the Hindu as a matter of prescriptive right. Kabir was claimed as a saint by both and worshipped as such by both. The saints of Maharashtra included Mohamedan saints like Shaik Mohamed. This fact of India before the British rule should not be lost sight of by the builder of unity today, as Ranade did not forget it, both in his social conference addresses and in his book, **The Rise of the Maratha Power.**

If the Hindu and the Mussulman are not so cordial and brotherly with one another today it is not because food, dress, civilisation, culture and even religion divide them. It is because the spurious politics of separation is being carried to him from the cities of Bombay, Calcutta, Karachi and Lahore for selfish domination and for the division of loaves and

fishes among interested parties who fan the flame and create the feuds. The division is not indigenous and, to use the famous phrase of Emerson, endogenic. It is super-imposed and foreign to the soil. Shall we unlearn and discard what we have learnt by centuries of association? Shall we embrace what is false, artificial, one-sided, and "one-ideaed", as Ranade coined the word when he stressed the point that one-eyed man was any day better than a 'one-indeaed' man. Shall we foment division, disunion and fanaticism of faith, or shall we rather extinguish the embers of dead controversy, now that the chapter is closed and a new era is about to open? Now we must exercise poise, sanity, charity, toleration. We must work for unity, co-operation and brotherhood. When the world is thinking of ending war by the federation of the world, shall we be ever harping upon the two-nations theory in India, shall we insist on Hindu India and Muslim India as enemies of one another, and refuse to federate for common purposes and common interests?

We wish to God earnestly that Mr. Jinnah, now the Governor-General of the dominion of Pakistan, lives long enough to put an end to all strife, and to stem the tide of disruption, division and hatred resulting in riots and all that they mean for the forty crores of people in India. May he change his ways now, and not sacrifice the true interests of India, which are vitally the interests of Hindus as well as Muslims. May he not sacrifice the country on the

altar of his wrath against the Congress. The Congress and the Muslim League are but institutions of the day in the long and chequered history of India. They have their day and they may cease to be. They will fade away while India will live. The patriot and the leader that he is, he must think of India as a whole, as one nation, a solid whole which belongs to Muslims and Hindus; and he must work from now onwards that future generations living in that India may say "the twain seemed never to meet; but the twain were never really parted; and shall not be parted." Like brothers they live, like brothers they love, like sons they serve their common mother, and like brothers they will go down in history as "co-operant to a common end."

XVI.

But Mr. Jinnah did not care what he said and what he did. He was out to achieve Pakistan and spite the Hindus at any cost. End justifies the means—that has been his line of action since the time that he changed in public life as an out-and-out communalist. He played with Lord Wavell as a cat plays with a mouse. Of course, the mouse, though fooled, was too big for the cat to kill. He promised and went back on his promise, and declared that he had not promised. And every step that the other man took to conciliate him only served to stiffen his neck and to increase his demand. The Cabinet Mission plan of May 16 was kept hanging in the air by him on one plea or another, and at last he had succeeded in

blowing it up after the Interim Government had been formed, his men had gone in, and had refused to participate in the Constituent Assembly. In all the transactions from 16th May, 1946 to June 3, 1947, he had succeeded by cold hauteur and bluff in browbeating the Congress, in fooling Lord Wavell, and in humiliating the British Cabinet. The correspondence on the subject shows to the world the weakness of the one and the bluff of the other. Sincerity, earnestness, the attitude of conciliation, the urge for unity and peace, have all been construed as weakness; and hauteur, challenge, wordy warfare, hair-splitting of the lawyer, have been mistaken for bold statesmanship! And, at last, he had his way with Lord Mountbatten, and, inspite of the Cabinet Mission's unanswerable arguments against Pakistan, in the preamble to their plan, India is divided into two.

But not only is India divided, but Punjab and Bengal as well. To that extent Mr. Jinnah's dream of Pakistan is not realised, and he had to be satisfied with truncated Pakistan, as the Congress High Command has to be satisfied with the nomenclature of "Union of India". With the North of India cut off from that dominion, and, with perhaps, prospective pockets of Pakistan in the shape of petty Muslim states, in its own dominion! Whatever that be, Mr. Jinnah has compelled by sheer pugnacity and with threat of violent conflict, both the Congress and the British Cabinet to accept and work out in full

detail the two nations theory for India. He got an independent Constituent Assembly for Pakistan, and independent army, navy and air-force; with assets and liabilities divided between the two dominions, with independent services and secretariats,—a division with a vengeance, as between two brothers. And who has been the mediator or the arbitrator? No other than one who posed to be dead against division, and who owned that he had brought law and order, security and peace, education and nationalism to a United India! And the cruel irony of it has been that Mr. Jinnah the nationalist has cut with his own hand the tie that had bound the two communities into one Union! What began in India in 1909 as separate communal electorates for Muslims has ended in 1947 in the partition of India and the complete division of assets between the two partners, as if others besides them had no stake in the country. They were given no voice and they were not heard in the final settlement. Are not their interests—and of generations unborn—bound up with the settlement? Obstinacy and obscurantism have won; experience of 150 years of history has been thrown overboard; and invention has triumphed.

This was not going to work like a statesman, it was working like a narrow-minded expert and politician egged on by an astute lawyer. As one penetrating writer has written on the subject, "A politician thinks of the next general election; a statesman of the next generation. A politician works

for the success of his party; a statesman for that of his country. The statesman wishes to steer, while the politician is satisfied to drift." The strife of politics tends to unsettle the common understanding, and ulcerate the most benevolent heart. There are no bigotries and absurdities too gross for parties to create or adopt under the stimulus of political passion. And what shall we say of the lawyer in the particular context? What Lamartine said of him in the days of the revolution and counter-revolution in France in which he himself had an active share. "In the habits of legal men every accusation appears insufficient if they do not exaggerate it even to calumny. It is thus that justice itself loses its sanctity and its respect among men." Further, that "lawyers on opposite sides are like the two parts of shears; they cut what comes between them, but not each other." The Congress is safe; the Muslim League is safe. The feud between Hindus and Muslims is apparently settled. But the country is "cleft into twain."

A hundred and fifty years of British rule in India, with all its terrible draw-backs as a dominion of one country over another, had given us peace and order, and an education on Western lines which, as a consequence, had made us nationalists and had developed in us a passion for freedom and self-government of United India. Mr. Jinnah was its staunch supporter and protagonist till 1921 when, because of the cult of Gandhism, he left the Indian

National Congress for good. And since then he had let himself go downward on the inclined slope of communalism—rank communalism and bigoted partizanship of one community against another. He who never stooped to call the Ali Brothers as Maulanas from the Congress platform, had now accepted the appellation of Quaide-Azam, and lets himself be hailed as a devout Muslim and the Sultan of Pakistan! What a change this—we shall not say what a fall—from the incorruptible nationalist, the champion of Home-rule, the spear-head of opposition to Lord Willington, to be a willing worker as the Governor-General of Pakistan, nominated as such by the King of England and Pakistan, albeit recommended for the post by the Muslim League which is no other than himself! The maker of Pakistan, he who carved it out from the body of Mother India, to be nominated as its first Governor-General! Mr. Jinnah has, apparently, won all along the line from 1933 to 1947. He has made history. But what will be the judgment of history upon his action? We cannot and we would not anticipate.

Evidently, Mr. Jinnah is mightily pleased with himself, for, otherwise, he would not have spoken in such generous terms and with such condescension of the non-Muslim minorities within his own domain. He now discountenances wholesale exchange of population from one dominion to another. He disowns the notion of theocratic state in Pakistan. Nay, he swears now that he never knew what it was. He

swears by democracy and ... known democracy for ... if it is pure democracy, ... democracy that I have ... and its emperor: in ... Aurangzeb. As a ... asserted that he was ... he meant. Up to that ... he was only a ... office ... General has ... however ... Finding it ...

... ...

India into the promised land of which Mahadeo Govind Ranade dreamt, and for which he and his worthy disciple Gokhale toiled all their lives. In retrospect of the struggle between the Muslims League consolidated and led by Mr. Jinnah and the Indian National Congress taking her orders for all practical purposes from Mr. Gandhi, what do we find in India on August 15, 1947?

The Congress may take to herself the glory of having killed all opposition, that it had made all other political organizations ridiculous and a spent-force; but, in the event, it had created a formidable opponent to conquer whom it had to stoop so many times during the period. It had at last failed to win him for the Union of India. To what condition had it reduced itself and reduced all other parties in the country is well-brought out by the following jibe against it, and that from the lips of Mr. Jinnah:--"There are however, others than the Hindu Mahasabha and the Liberal Federation, the non-party Conference now called the Sapru conference. All these Hindu organizations are one and the same. They masquerade under different names but patrol and reconnoitre on behalf of the Congress." But how has the Congress treated them? How has the Congress High Command dealt with them? What had Mr. Gandhi to say of these Hindu bodies "masquerading under different names but to patrol and reconnoitre on behalf of the Congress"? It cared not for the Hindu Mahasabha, it treated the Liberal Federation with utter contempt, it poured

ridicule over the Sapru Conference, for it flattered itself that it alone could deliver the goods. And it has delivered the goods not to the British Cabinet, but to Mohamed Ali Jinnah.

That chapter has now closed. The 9th of August has been wiped out, and the 15th August takes its place. The twenty-sixth of January has fallen behind, and the third of June supercedes it. Time has now come to write upon the Congress agitation from 1921 to 1942 the one word "antiquity." So will Mr. Jinnah, let us hope, put the same label on the League activity between 1937 and 1947. If Noakhali and Bihar, Amritsar and Lahore are no more to reenact their drama of riot, stabbing, arson, rape and loot that they enacted from the first of September, 1946, then we must turn to better ways than those that had commended themselves to the Congress and the Muslim League during the ten years of high-handedness, disruption, dictatorship and division, issuing ultimately in unrest and bloodshed all over India. The leaders on both the sides, in charge of the two new dominions in India, as its statesmen, must say nothing, do nothing, and even think nothing that will mean the loss of freedom for all, and mean the travesty of the hackneyed phrase, "government of the people, for the people and by the people." Time has come for all Indian leaders to pray, live and work for an India of which Rabindra Nath Tagore dreamt and sang in his **Gitanjali**. With that prayer we would close the study that occupied us so long.

“Where the mind is without fear and
 the head is held high;
 where knowledge is free;

Where the world has not broken up in
 fragments by narrow domestic walls;

Where words come out from the depth of truth;

Where tireless striving stretches its
 arms towards perfection;

Where the clear stream of reason has not lost
 its way into the dreary desert sand
 of dead habit.

Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever
 widening thought and action—

Into that heaven of freedom, my Father,

Let my country awake.”

What better gleam could there be for our leaders
 and statesmen to follow in Hindusthan and Pakistan,
 that their country might awake into “this heaven of
 Freedom” for which the poet lived and sang all his
 life?

XVII.

The foregoing pages were written for publication on the 15th of August, 1947, to synchronise with the celebration of the day of independence in the Union of India and in the Dominion of Pakistan, when the Boundary Commission had not yet given its award on the demarcation of East Punjab from West Punjab, of East Bengal from West Bengal, and on Sylhet in Assam. Events have shown what the award has cost India in the loss of life and property, in the migration of population from one dominion to the other, in the horrid condition, all round, of the refugees, and in the panicky state of mind of the minorities in either part of the country.

Thanks to Mahatma Gandhi, peace has been restored in Bengal. He is now in Delhi and he has seen for himself what havoc the spirit of hatred has worked in Punjab and at Delhi. The Union of India Government had to fight against tremendous odds to conquer this hatred and the orgy of riot, loot, murder and arson that followed in its wake. Both Pakistan and the Union of India find it hard to kill this monster of Communalism. At Delhi Mr. Gandhi has grown almost desperate by what he has seen and felt. But Mr. Jinnah is silent except for the horrors in East Punjab, and has not a word to say for equal horrors in West Punjab. And his satellites are busy hurling challenges and heaping iniquities. Persons in responsible offices should say nothing of which they

are not sure. But these satellites have done it, and Mr. Jinnah has not muzzled them.

Pakistan has not brought peace to India any more than Pakistan has brought peace to Pakistan itself. Why? Because the hymn of hate still continues, and people do not find peace and safety anywhere. There are other things to be done. But nothing can be done till this frenzy is overcome. Lahore, Karachi, Amritsar, Delhi—all have the same tale of woe to narrate. Statesmanship is bankrupt and humanity is at a discount. It is just over three months from the Independence day of August 15. And Pakistan has to appeal to Great Britain and the Dominions to end the communal quarrel in India. Peace was foretold as the positive result of the partition of India. Friendship was promised between the two nations, as also the end of all communal troubles. And each dominion was confident that it could start its work of consolidation and reconstruction without let or hindrance from either side. But today not order but chaos rules umpire. Not good government but anarchy holds the field. And self-government has meant utter incapacity to govern oneself.

Let us no more apportion praise and blame. Let us stop this hymn of hate. Peccavi. Let us confess and turn over a new leaf. Hindus and Muslims are the two eyes of Mother India. Let the two eyes come into their proper focus, that they may see clearly and visualise the danger ahead of them. Then wisdom

will dawn, sanity prevail, and good come out of evil. Man's perplexity, they say, is God's opportunity. But only so, when we can say and behave like Abraham Lincoln, the great president of America, in the great crisis of the American Civil war, when he ever prayed, not that God should be on his side, but that it should be given him to be on God's side. Gandhi in the Union of India is saying and behaving so. Will Jinnah do the same in Pakistan? Let us be men before we are statesmen, let us be gentlemen before we are patriots, let us be children of light before we presume to be rulers of men. Then only the kindly light will lead us, and it will not lead us astray.

